UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/976,579	11/24/1997	JAMES D. THORNTON	JAO-34191	2070

7590 10/20/2004

OLIFF & BERRIDGE
P O BOX 19928
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320

EXAMINER	
JUNG, DAVID YIUK	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2134	

DATE MAILED: 10/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	08/976,579	THORNTON	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	David Y Jung	2134	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *24 May 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *29-37 and 39-45* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *29-37 and 39-45* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

CLAIMS PRESENTED

Claims 29-37 and 39-45 are presented.

Claims 29, 32, 34, 36, 39, 41 are independent claims. The other claims are dependent claims.

Response to Arguments

In view of the entire prosecution history (including its inconsistencies and its unclear record as pointed out in the Claim Rejections Section) and in view of the Appeal Brief filed on May 24, 2004, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. New rejections are set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) request reinstatement of the appeal.

If reinstatement of the appeal is requested, such request must be accompanied by a supplemental appeal brief, but no new amendments, affidavits (37 CFR 1.130, 1.131 or 1.132) or other evidence are permitted. See 37 CFR 1.193(b)(2).

CLAIM REJECTIONS

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112 2nd

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 29-37, 39-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Where applicant acts as his or her own lexicographer to specifically define a term of a claim contrary to its ordinary meaning, the written description must clearly redefine the claim term and set forth the uncommon definition so as to put one reasonably skilled in the art on notice that the applicant intended to so redefine that claim term. *Process Control Corp. v. HydReclaim Corp.*, 190 F.3d 1350, 1357, 52 USPQ2d 1029, 1033 (Fed. Cir. 1999). The term "document" in claims is used inconsistently in the claims themselves. This has brought us to the situation of the application having redefined the term, but not clearly having defined the term.

The term is indefinite because the specification does not clearly redefine the term. In some of the claims (such as at claims 31 and 33), a paper document is being referred. If the documents are paper documents, then what is meant by "document"? Such a document can be a paper book. Then, what is a token? A token in a document is a symbol. A token that is a pointer to another document can be a mere index at the end of a book. Decoders and selectors can be mere page numbers enumerated at index pages. Because of the inconsistencies created by the claims, the broadest reasonable interpretation is now very broad.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112 1st

The following are quotations of the **first** paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112 and of the MPEP which interprets that paragraph:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

> **MPEP 2164.08(a) Single Means Claim**
>
> A single means claim, i.e., where a means recitation does not appear in combination with another recited element of means, is subject to an undue breadth rejection under **35 U.S.C. 112**, first paragraph. *In re Hyatt*, 708 F.2d 712, 714-715, 218 USPQ 195, 197 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (A single means claim which covered every conceivable means for achieving the stated purpose was held nonenabling for the scope of the claim because the specification disclosed at most only those means known to the inventor.). When claims depend on a recited property, a fact situation comparable to *Hyatt* is possible, where the claim covers every conceivable structure (means) for achieving the stated property (result) while the specification discloses at most only those known to the inventor.

Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Claim 32 is a single means claim (of selector means).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 29-37, 39-45 are rejected under 35 USC 101. The claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The subject matter (which, as noted in

the rejections under 35 USC 112) is that of reading and handling tokens (which are semantic symbols) from a document such as a paper. Thus, the subject matter is that of reading a paper. Semantic content of a paper may be appropriate for a copyright, but is not appropriate for a patent.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 29-37, 39-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over admitted prior art ("APA").

As noted in the file history (such as at page 2 of the Appeal Brief) and (of course as of common sense), APA teaches such document handling of claims 29-37, 39-45 except for the terminology of "token."

It was well known in the art (even if applicant has so far adamantly refused to admit) to use tokens in a document for the motivation of pointing to another document and even of pointing to symbols and concepts in another document. Applicant clearly wishes to mean something very specific with the word "token." For the reasons noted in the rejections under 35 USC 112, Applicant has fallen short of his wishes. Thus, with the broadest reasonable interpretation of the

word "token", the Office (for this moment and until receiving further explanation) uses the term "token" in the broad sense (in the sense noted in the rejections under 35 USC 112).

Hence, it would have been obvious to those of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to combine APA with such tokens for the motivation noted in the previous paragraphs so as to teach the claimed invention.

Conclusion

The art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The art disclosed general background. They were discussed in the prior Office Actions.

Points of Contact

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 746-7239, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

(703) 746-5606 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington. VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Jung whose telephone number is (703) 308-5262 or Greg Morse whose telephone number is (703) 308-4789.

David Jung

Patent Examiner

10/18/04